

REMARKS

The dependency of claim 7 has been changed, and claim 8 has been amended to address the 35 U.S.C. 112 issues.

The claims are clearly patentable over the references.

Claim 1 was rejected as anticipated by Stobie, and was separately rejected as obvious over Niedzwiecki in view of Wood et al. Stobie does not anticipate claim 1. Stobie discloses multi-conductor cables, but does not disclose or suggest a coaxial cable with coaxial conductors; clearly none of the Stobie conductors are coaxial. Further, Stobie's cable conductors are not in proximity to one another. Rather, the conductors are terminated on the conductive rods 88, 90 that are part of the contact blocks 22, 62. See column 6 lines 5-43. As Stobie does not disclose either of these claim elements, the reference cannot anticipate claim 1.

Niedzwiecki does not use ACE or anything like ACE. Further, Niedzwiecki compresses contact members 16 so that they make electrical contact with a conductor of each of the ribbon cable. Niedzwiecki also does not place the conductors in proximity to one another. Wood uses ACE to connect to circuit boards or flex circuits. If the ACE of Wood was substituted for the center block and contact members of Niedzwiecki, Niedzwiecki would not function properly. One reason is that Niedzwiecki is arranged such that the square center block is held in place by the "V"-shaped depressions of the clamp blocks. Substituting a flat ACE layer into the structure of Niedzwiecki would not accomplish electrical connection between the two cables, as the ACE would not contact both cables and would not be compressed by the clamp blocks; compression is the means by which ACE becomes anisotropically conductive. As the combination of the two references would effect the utility of Niedzwiecki, under the law of 35 U.S.C. 103, the combination is improper. Claim 1 must thus be patentable over these references.


Independent claim 15 was rejected as obvious over Buck et al. in view of Wood et al. Claim 17 has been added to claim 15. Claim 17 was rejected as obvious over Buck and Wood as applied to claim 15, and further in view of Niedzwiecki. Amended claim 15 is clearly patentable over the references. Buck teaches a ribbon cable to printed circuit board connector. Wood teaches the use of ACE in a separable connector. Niedzwiecki teaches interconnection of two ribbon cables. However, as described above, Niedzwiecki could not use ACE in its connector. Accordingly, it is improper to combine Wood and Niedzwiecki in this manner. Claim 15 must thus be patentable.

Independent claim 18 was rejected as anticipated by Stobie. Stobie does not anticipate claim 18. In Stobie, the ACE is between the halves of the connector, at the ends of the conductive rods 88, 90; the ACE in Stobie does not contact the flex cable conductors. As this element of claim 18 is not disclosed by Stobie, the reference cannot anticipate claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. 102.

Each of the Examiner's rejections has been addressed or traversed. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Early and favorable action is respectfully requested.

If for any reason this Response is found to be incomplete, or if at any time it appears that a telephone conference with counsel would help advance prosecution, please telephone the undersigned in Westborough, Massachusetts, (508) 898-1501.

Respectfully submitted,



Brian M. Dingman
Reg. No. 32,729
Customer No. 28534